DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 744 CG 026 158

AUTHOR Wilczenski, Felicia L.; And Others
TITLE Promoting "Fair Play": Interventions for Children as Victims and Victimizers.
PUB DATE 94
NOTE 53p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists (26th, Seattle, WA, March 4-5, 1994).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Aggression; Antisocial Behavior; *Child Behavior; Children; Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hostility; *Intervention; Student Attitudes; *Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Bullying; *Victimization

ABSTRACT

Because of escalating violence in our nation's schools and neighborhoods, childhood aggression is receiving intense public scrutiny. This article offers a systemic perspective for understanding the pervasive problem of bullying and victimization by clarifying adult attitudes toward childhood aggression; by reviewing the familial, educational, and societal systems which influence interpersonal relationships among children; by examining multicultural issues; by explaining victimization as a continuum of behavior; and by considering the issue of children as victims and victimizers through an emphasis on the relationship between the two. The issues covered here include changing views on childhood aggression; victimization from home to school; a definition of bully behavior; racial bullying; cross-gender bullying; the prevalence of bullying; bullies and victims; aspects of interpersonal bullying relationships; victimization as an aversive experience; shattering victims' assumptions of a just world; implications for intervention; and prevention. The latter topic leads into a description of the Fair Play program which was developed by analyzing the motives for bullying as well as the link between victims and victimizers. Since the Fair Play program uses sociodramatic techniques, some of the program's activities, which were designed to help children avoid violence, are provided. (Contains 110 references.) (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running Head: VICTIMS AND VICTIMIZERS

ED 380 744

Promoting "Fair Play:"
Interventions For Children As Victims And Victimizers

Felicia L. Wilczenski

Rhode Island College, Providence

Ruth Steegmann

West Seneca, NY Public Schools

and

Michelle Braun

Erie County, NY Board of Cooperative Educational Services

Francis Feeley

Chicago, IL Public Schools

Jennifer Griffin

Williamsville, NY Public Schools

Thomas Horowitz

Kenmore-Tonawanda, NY Union Free School District

Suzanne Olson

Rochester, NY Public Schools

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. WILCZENSKI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Workshop presented at the 1994 annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Seattle, WA.

The last five authors are listed alphabetically.

Please address correspondence to: Felicia L. Wilczenski, Ed.D., Department of Counseling and Educational Psychology, School Psychology Program, 108 Adams, Rhode Island College, Providence, RI 02908.

CG026158

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Because of escalating violence in our nation's schools and neighborhoods, childhood aggression is receiving intense public scrutiny. According to a report issued by the National School Safety Center in 1989, bullying and victimization ranging from teasing and exclusion to physical violence that results in death, are perhaps the most misunderstood and under-reported problems in schools today. Bullies and victims are an appropriate unit to begin to study systems of violent behavior in schools. By emphasizing the interactional aspects of bullying behavior, the roles of both players are recognized. Besides the bully and the victim, bullying behavior points to characteristics of the home, school, and society. This article offers a systemic perspective for understanding the pervasive problem of bullying and victimization by: (a) clarifying adult attitudes toward childhood aggression; (b) reviewing the familial, educational, and societal systems which influence interpersonal relationships among children; (c) examining multicultural issues; (d) explaining victimization as a continuum of behavior; and (e) considering the issue of children as victims and victimizers by emphasizing the relationship between the two. Finally, the rationale and a description of a preventive program dealing with children as victims and victimizers is presented.

Promoting "Fair Play": Interventions For Children As Victims And Victimizers

Bullying happens all the time
In class, at home, or in the lunch line
Bullies punch, kick, threaten, and steal
Then I don't have money for my lunch meal
They try to be cool by making others hurt
And that makes you feel like dirt
I don't know how they can stand to do such
If I tried bullying, I'd feel bad too much

Tracy, Amy, & Phil, Grade 5
FAIR PLAY Program Participants
May, 1993

Changing Views on Childhood Aggression

Opinions about the significance and management of childhood aggression have fluctuated over the course of the twentieth century. In the early 1900s, Hall (1904) suggested that negative feelings could be catharted by aggression and recommended that children be permitted to fight in play. For several decades, this view was endorsed by psychologists (Jersild & Markey, 1935) and educators (Franklin & Benedict, 1951; Shannon, 1956), and teaching students to fight was discussed as a legitimate educational aim (Derby, 1947). More recently, the popular literature has recommended that fighting not be allowed (Hotelling, 1970; Roberts, 1988). Conversely, the professional literature has indicated that fighting is normal among children (Parks, 1986; Stocker, Dunn, & Plomin, 1989) and that children fight to gain attention so adult intervention is unwise (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1973; Dreikurs, 1964; Schacter & Stone, 1987). Research findings (Brody & Stoneman, 1987; Levi, Buskila,

& Gerzi, 1977) that ignoring verbal or physical fighting among children can lead to a more peaceful atmosphere provided further support for a nonintervention stance.

The conventional wisdom has been that adults should not interfere in struggles between children to avoid giving attention to conflictual behavior and to allow children to develop social problem solving skills on their own. A position of nonintervention presumes that children involved in a conflict are physically, cognitively, socially, and emotionally equal, and if left alone, will find a better way than fighting to solve their problems. Those presumptions are dangerously unrealistic (Marion, 1982), and a "might makes right" resolution to children's conflicts seems more likely than negotiation and compromise.

Cultural, Familial, and Educational Sanctions for Aggression

"Might makes right" is prevalent in our culture. Our society not only sanctions but celebrates aggression in business, sports, and foreign policy. Often television sends the message that violence is an efficient problem solving strategy; rarely is the plight of the victim highlighted.

There is general consensus among psychologists and educators that active and assertive behavior is a normal and desirable characteristic for American children, particularly for males. However, bullies are distinct in a number of ways: they are quick to start a fight, are belligerent, and use force and intimidation to get their way (Olweus, 1991). Powerful defensive reactions

such as anger and thoughts of revenge are common among victims (Floyd, 1987). By acting on those feelings, victims become aggressors. And retaliation by victims, even in self-defense, is a key element in escalating violence.

Escalating violence may be overlooked by caretakers who have become desensitized to aggression. Hranitz and Eddowes (1990) discussed the impact of the disintegrating family on the increase in violence in American society. There is less adult supervision of children's activities, less monitoring of violent TV watching, and less modeling of appropriate conflict resolution strategies. Also, power-dependent relationships within families (e.g., dominant male, submissive female) provide a model for bullying, which itself is based on quest for power. Bennett (1990) suggested that parental nonintervention into siblings' fighting can induce learned helplessness in the victims.

Nonintervention by adults in the face of childhood aggression may be perceived as approval of the aggressor and aggression is tacitly reinforced. Children are rewarded if they get what they want by being aggressive. Social learning theory (Bandura 1973, 1976) explains aggression: children learn to be aggressive by observing aggression, being ignored for aggression, being reinforced for aggressiveness, or being punished hurtfully, either physically or verbally, for aggression.

Aggression and bullying behavior are traditions in American schools. Hazing, bushings, beat-downs, and other abusive rituals have been tolerated in high schools and colleges as a rite of

passage; in turn, the abused younger students are expected to get revenge when they are older. Moreover, bullying behavior may be observed from teacher to student. In schools, bullying is legitimized as corporal punishment, which is an accepted disciplinary policy in many states. School reward structures are often a model for victimization. At all levels of the educational system, students are in a vulnerable position and have few resources to defend themselves against teachers who abuse power. Our own small scale survey (Wilczenski et al., 1993a) indicated that many elementary level teachers (58%) in a suburban Buffalo, NY school district witnessed bullying behavior on the part of their colleagues toward students.

Thus, the cultural acceptance of violence, the intergenerational transmission of violent behavior, and the power-dependent relationships which exist in some families and schools are sanctions for aggression. Bullying and victimization are culturally, familially, and educationally transmitted modes of interaction.

Victimization From Home To School

What is the link between victims and victimizers? In a best selling novel, Margaret Atwood (1988) described the process of victimization from home to school. The link between conflicted family interactions and child behavior problems outside the home has been well-established in the professional literature (for example, see Aber & Cicchetti, 1984; Bowers, Smith, & Binney, 1992; Dishion, Patterson, Stoolmiller, & Skinner, 1991; Dodge,

Bates, & Pettit; 1990; Eckenrode, Laird, & Doris, 1993; Manning, Heron, & Marshall, 1978; Morton, 1987; Olweus, 1980, 1984; Patterson, 1982; Rutter, 1985; Salzinger, Feldman, Hammer, & Rosario, 1993; Stephenson & Smith, 1989; Sternberg et al., 1993; Straus, 1991; Vissing, Straus, Gelles, Harrop, 1991; Widom, 1989a,b).

Why do bullies and victims behave the way they do? Overwhelming evidence indicates that the victim at home is a bully at school. Bullies come from homes where parents prefer physical means of discipline (Eron & Huesmann, 1984; Stephens, 1988; Widom, 1989b). Living with abusive parents teaches children that aggression and violence are appropriate and effective means of solving problems and attaining goals. Children see aggression as a successful form of social interaction and consequently, act more aggressively with peers. Over the years, the following conclusions have been formulated: Bullies have been subjected to physical punishment or abuse as children and parents of bullies have tended to use power assertive disciplinary techniques coupled with negative parental attitudes. In addition, silent violence towards a child exerted by means of negativism, indifference, and lack of involvement seems to be detrimental to the child's personality development (Lowenstein, 1978; Olweus, 1978; Woolfson, 1989).

"Bullies bully because of a strong need for power and a need for affiliation" (O'Moore, 1988, p.20). Highly permissive, tolerant or lax attitudes without clear limits for a child's

behavior, together with the use of power assertive discipline methods have a two-fold effect on children. First, it produces a power motive system as well as diminishing inhibition towards aggression. Second, the negativism of parents towards their children produces a special need for affiliation. Because they feel powerless to control their home situation, bullies look for a victim to dominate in order to gain a sense of power and control. These "anxious bullies" (O'Moore, 1988; Stephenson & Smith, 1989) are similar to the popular notion of a bully, that is, the bully is a coward. Feelings of isolation at home also lead to an intense need to identify and attach to a group. To further group cohesion, bullying occurs by excluding others. With regard to these bullying motives, gender differences have been noted: The power factor more significantly determines male bullying behavior and the need for affiliation has a greater impact on female bullying behavior (Lane, 1989; O'Moore, 1988). Typically, boys bully by physical assaults whereas girls use exclusion (Roland, 1989).

Being a victim is also a learned behavior. The victim at home may be a victim at school as well. Parents or siblings may be negatively reinforced by a child for the use physical punishment or intimidation and become trapped in an abusive cycle of interactions. A child may learn helplessness when there is no escape from adult or sibling abuse in the home (Bennett, 1990). Victims may feel powerless and therefore, will not seek assistance or a reprieve from their victimization. Escapist

reactions may develop such as school phobia, truancy, and at the extreme, suicide (Lowenstein, 1978).

Definition of Bully Behavior

The act of bullying has been defined by Kikkawa (1987) as ". . . aggressive behavior which occurs in most cases on the personal relations among bullies, victims, and bystanders in formal or informal social groups" (p.26). Greenbaum (1988) further defined bullying as ". . . one or more individuals inflicting physical, verbal or emotional abuse on another individual or individuals" (p.3). Besag (1989) stated that ". . . three factors are associated in any bullying activity: it must occur over a prolonged period of time rather than being a single aggressive act; it must involve an imbalance of power, the powerful attacking the powerless; and it can be verbal, physical, or psychological in nature" (p.3). The results of bullying can range from a black eye to broken bones and even death, an extreme but not unprecedented consequence. Verbal and emotional bullying such as harassment and exclusion, are less conspicuous and are not as likely to be reported, but can create fear, anxiety, and pain tantamount to that resulting from physical abuse.

Racial Bullying

Racism is a complex topic beyond the scope of this paper. One aspect of racism, however, involves a power relationship. In order for racism to work, it is necessary to destroy the victim's identity and to claim superiority for the oppressor (Pine & Hilliard, 1990). Therefore, racism involves the assertion of

power over a powerless victim for personal gain. Pine and Hilliard (1990) further assert that racism is characterized by "phobic reactions to differences" (p.595), just as bullying often occurs because victims are perceived to be different from other children in some way. "At its most insidious [bullying] focuses on vulnerable children who are regarded as being different because of their ethnic origins, homosexual orientations, or, physical or mental disabilities" (Tattum, 1989, p.7).

The following excerpt from a poem entitled "Back in the Playground Blues," emphasizes this point:

> You get it for being Jewish
> Get it for being black
> Get it for being chicken
> Get it for fighting back
> You get it for being big and fat
> Get it for being small
> O those who get it, get it and get it
> For any damn thing at all
> (Rosen, 1985)

Much of the research that specifically examines racial bullying has taken place outside of the United States. The Commission for Racial Equality (1988) conducted a survey, "Learning in Terror," to assess the incidence of racial abuse and violence in schools and colleges throughout England, Scotland, and Wales. This report highlighted the plight of ethnic minorities being bullied in schools and in their communities.

> Though our evidence is anecdotal rather than statistical, there are enough reports and local studies to lead to the conclusion that children from ethnic minorities not only suffer from frequent acts of racial harassment but experience the insecurity and anxiety from the threatening atmosphere associated with the possibility of racial insults, graffiti, and violence directed at them, their families and their communities anywhere and at any time, including the school and its approaches. (p. 7)

Cross-Gender Bullying

The topic of cross-gender bullying has received little professional attention. Even though most bullying occurs among same-sex peers, cross-gender bullying has been reported among British school children in a survey conducted by Boulton and Underwood (1992). Instances of cross-gender bullying are often inappropriately dismissed as flirtation. One might speculate on the later effects of that interpretation: What message do we send young girls when abusive behavior by boys is equated with "liking?" Being teased by girls may interfere with later dating adjustment of boys. Love shy adult males in a study by Gilmartin (1987) recalled being victimized during childhood.

Prevalence of Bullying

Statistics on violence suggest that schools in the United States are not a safe place for learning and peer interaction. In 1989, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention reported "nearly 3 million attempted or completed street crimes (assault, rape, robbery, or theft) took place inside of or on school property during 1987" (p.1). Batsche and Moore (1992) cited findings that in a typical month approximately 285,000 students are physically attacked. School psychologists have noted increases in aggressive behavior and victimization (Larson, 1993), and "minor" victimizations and indignities are reported to occur often (Garofalo, Siegel, & Laub, 1987).

Because bullying usually takes place out of the sight of those in authority and may be psychological rather than physical,

the prevalence of bullying in our nation's schools may be seriously underestimated (Bowers et al., 1992; National School Safety Center, 1989). Virtually every classroom has been affected by bullying to some degree (Olweus, 1987). Estimates of bullying and victimization vary somewhat due to the types of questions asked on surveys. Using the Besag (1989) definition of repeated bullying, there is general agreement in the literature that approximately 20% of school children are involved in bullying, either as victims or victimizers (see Olweus, 1978; Stephenson & Smith, 1988; Toch, Gest, & Guttman, 1993; Whitney & Smith, 1992).

Most research has examined victimization rates across various subgroups defined by demographic variables. By analyzing narrative data available in the National Crime Survey, Garofalo and colleagues (1987) provided important insights concerning incidents of victimization not available from highly structured questionnaire data. Those narrative data suggest that school-related victimizations stem from peer interactions occurring in the course of routine daily activities that escalate into victimizing events. Students are populations of potential victimizers and potential victims who are in frequent contact with each other, often in the absence of adult supervision. The picture that emerges from the work of Garfalo and colleagues regarding school-based victimization is not one of a stalker and innocent prey, but rather of a bullying relationship that gets out of hand. Even though most victimizations were considered to

be "bothersome" rather than "injurious," the frequency with which students victimize each other warrants attention according to the authors.

According to the report issued by the National Center for School Safety in 1989, the chief school related concern of students is the disruptive and inappropriate behavior of other students, i.e., bullies, and not academic success. Both principals and parents underestimate student concerns for personal safety. On our surveys (Wilczenski et al., 1993a) parents and teachers rated bullying a minor problem at school whereas 82% of the students responding indicated that they had observed instances of bullying recently and 55% reported having been bullied themselves.

Educational achievement is related to a set of variables called "school climate." One critical point from this area of research is that real and perceived physical and psychological safety enhances student performance (Anderson, 1982). Fear and anxiety engendered by bullying is a distraction from learning.

Bullies and Victims

Olweus (1991) reported that bullies are often impulsive, have a strong need to dominate others, and lack empathy with their victims. To bolster their own self-esteem, bullies put others down (Hazler, Hoover, & Oliver, 1991). They evidence poor leadership skills according to Trawick-Smith (1988). Bullies see themselves as dominant, have high ideals of dominating behavior, and believe that dominance is the social norm (Bjorkqvist, Ekman,

& Lagerspetz, 1982). Other self-perceptions of bullies include impulsiveness, physical superiority, and positive attitudes toward aggression (Floyd, 1986; Lane, 1988; Lowenstein, 1978).

A victim is defined as an individual who suffers as a result of his or her own actions, impersonal forces, or another person's actions, whether accidental or intentional (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 1993). Olweus (1978) described two types of victims: (a) passive victims are anxious, insecure, and neither provoke attacks nor defend themselves when attacked; and (b) provocative victims are restless, anxious, and will retaliate when attacked. Besag (1989) added the category of colluding victim: those individuals who take the role of victim to gain acceptance. Woolfson (1989) expanded on this colluding relationship by introducing the term "willing victim." This victim gains attention and sympathy through the hostility they generate in bullies; these children willingly accept the role as the victim to elicit attention from bystanders. Bully-victims are children who both bully others and are themselves bullied (Stephenson & Smith, 1989). Recently, Batsche and Knoff (1994) provided a comprehensive review of the characteristics of bullies and victims.

Traditionally, schools have focused on the perpetrators of violence. Aggressiveness has been viewed as a discipline problem, labeled "conduct disorder" (DSM IV), with treatment efforts aimed at rehabilitating the aggressor. Generally, bullies are not considered seriously disturbed to meet the

diagnostic criteria for the psychiatric label nor are they eligible for special education services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Instead, they are a subtype of antisocial or aggressive children; not all aggressive children are bullies. For bullies, aggression is person-oriented and a way of life rather than an uncontrolled response to frustration (Harvard Education Letter, 1987). There is an interpersonally hostile element to bullying and bullies do not pick fair fights (Coie, Dodge, Terry, & Wright, 1991; Kaplan, 1980; Olweus, 1978, 1984). Successful bullies are socially well-attuned to the impact of their aggression. Bullies differ from other aggressive children because they seem to use aggression selectively to pick on students who are weak, unpopular, or unable to retaliate (Harvard Education Letter, 1987). When the goal is to harass or dominate another child, the bully must pay close attention to the characteristics of the potential victim, avoiding those who would resist.

Researchers have started to study differences between aggressive children who are not socially isolated from those who are loners. Notable about this research is the finding that bullies are as popular as their non-bully peers (Olweus, 1984), whereas other chronically aggressive children tend to be less popular (Foster, DeLawyer, & Guevremont, 1986; Kaufman, 1985). Unlike other aggressive children, bullies are not censored by peers for their behavior. Bullies not only expect many rewarding outcomes and few negative ones for attacking a victim, they are

relatively unmoved by the prospect of causing pain and suffering to a victimized child (Perry, Williard, & Perry, 1990).

Another pertinent finding in a study concerned with antisocial behavior among children in France (Duyme, 1990), was that reports of bullying did not vary as function of social class whereas rates of a number reported antisocial behaviors (e.g., truancy, disobedience, lying, fighting, and destructiveness) were inversely related to social class: the higher the socio-economic level, the lower the antisocial behavior rates. Bullying may be a more socially acceptable form of aggression across all social classes because the victim may be seen as deserving fate. These findings are troubling in suggesting that it is socially acceptable to victimize certain children.

Aspects of the Interpersonal Bullying Relationship

Descriptions of episodes of victimization in school indicate that victimization is rarely random -- victims generally know their attackers (Garofalo et al., 1987; National Institute of Education, 1978). Yet the victims of bullies have been largely ignored for two reasons: (a) victims may seem to provoke aggression or appear weak, thus deserving their fate (Lerner, 1980); and (b) examining the role of victims in their victimization may be viewed as "blaming the victim," which has been discredited as an interpretation of victimization today. But victimization needs to be understood in terms of the relationship between an aggressor and victim. Usually victims are seen as potential targets by aggressors because they behave

in ways that are compatible with the aggressor's needs and motives (Floyd, 1985). Thus, bullies and victims are connected by powerful psychological forces. The victim's behavior: anxiety, dependence, passivity, immaturity, are provocative factors for a bully, who is defending against those vulnerabilities, and cannot tolerate that kind of weakness. The victim may feel guilty and deserving of punishment for displaying such weak behavior and actually provoke aggression (Bender, 1976). In response, the bully may be verbally or physically aggressive meeting the victim's need to be punished and reinforcing the victim's self-image as a victim. Bully/victim problems are likely to surface in any classroom where such a mix of personalities exist.

Scapegoat theory is also relevant in understanding the relationship of victims and bullies at school: aggressive tendencies, which cannot be directed toward the target (e.g., teachers, schools, parents) may be displaced on a less dangerous target -- the victim or scapegoat (Allan, 1983; Bender, 1976). When bullies and victims are together for extended periods such as at school, they may form complementary pairs and a stable pattern of relating may develop.

Bullies and victims are an appropriate unit of analysis to study systems of violent behavior in schools and to address intervention or preventive efforts. Emphasizing the interactional totality of the bullying act, the study of bully-victim relationships is critical because the role and responsibility of both players is recognized.

Victimization as an Aversive Experience

Victimization by peers may have long term implications for personal adjustment (Olweus, 1993). Victimization is an aversive experience because it represents a loss of material resources, social status (Taylor, Wood, & Lichtman, 1983) or a loss of control (Burgess & Holmstrom, 1979; Walker, 1979). Feeling out of control can produce cognitive, behavioral, motivation, and emotional deficits (see Thompson, 1981 for review).

It is useful to distinguish between primary victimization (e.g., a physical disability) and secondary victimization, i.e., negative social reactions to the primary victimization such as hostility, derogation, and rejection (Taylor et al., 1983). Usually, victims must deal with both the initial victimizing situation and the negative social consequences. Secondary victimization may interfere with interpersonal relationships and self-esteem. As others respond to the victim, the victim may come to internalize the responses and begin to think of the self in the same way (Gove, 1975). Even the "better" responses to the plight of the victim, concern or pity, may be perceived as condescending and underscore the victim's loss of status, consequently lowering self-esteem (DePaulo & Fisher, 1980). Asking for help is risky for a victim because of possible evaluations of incompetence by the helper as DePaulo and Fisher point out. Anticipating derogation from others can result in an attempt to minimize one's status as a victim. Because victimization is aversive, victims need to socially manage their

status by "de-victimizing" themselves (Taylor et al., 1983); that is, victims may prefer to keep their status unknown which may interfere with getting appropriate help (Garofalo et al., 1987).

Victimization: Shattering Assumptions of a Just World

Assumptions about how the world is organized allow people to function from day-to-day without overwhelming anxiety about uncertainties in life or their own vulnerabilities. The "just world" theory (Lerner, 1980) refers to an assumption about the organization of human experience that is pertinent to an understanding of victimization: a just world is one in which people get what they deserve. Children look for "imminent" justice wherein people are rewarded or punished immediately for their actions, but for adults, "ultimate" justice or an assumption that things will work out in the long run replaces the earlier imminent justice perspective of childhood. People need to feel they can control their fate by taking precautions or being good. The fates of victims and non-victims alike are seen as deserved.

According to Lerner (1980), perceiving others to be victims of random events threatens the just world theory, therefore, certain behaviors or personality characteristics will be seen as antecedents for different outcomes. People make judgments about the appropriateness of the outcome of any event based on assumptions that there is justice in the world. For example, a person judged to be strong, attractive, conscientious, or intelligent, would be seen as deserving of a positive outcome;

conversely, a person judged to be weak, unfriendly, ugly, or stupid, would be seen as deserving some degree of punishment. Observers even construe events, including personal attributes, to fit the belief that a person deserves his or her fate and thereby, blame the victim.

Being victimized destroys one's assumptions about a just world so that the experience of being a victim lasts longer than the victimizing episode itself (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). A victim can no longer say "it can't happen to me" and may feel a sense of helplessness in the face of uncontrollable forces. Once victimized it is easier to see oneself as a victim again. Victims of repeated abuse may learn helplessness and lose the motivation to respond (Bennett, 1990; Hiroto & Seligman, 1975; Seligman, 1975). The American Psychiatric Association (1994) has classified the common reactions of victims to psychologically traumatizing events, including shock, confusion, helplessness, anxiety, fear, and depression, as post-traumatic stress disorder. Janoff-Bulman (1992) suggested that the stress is largely attributable to the shattering of victims' basic assumptions about a just world.

Coping with victimization involves rebuilding one's shattered assumptions about the world which must include one's experience as a victim (Janoff-Bulman & Frieze 1983). One type of attribution, self-blame, is discussed by Janoff-Bulman and Frieze as particularly helpful in enabling victims to rebuild their assumptive world. Two types of self-blame are identified:

characterological and behavioral. The distinction between the two types of self-blame is the perceived controllability of the factor blamed. Characterological self-blame involves blaming one's victimization to enduring personality characteristics. This type of self-blame is a debilitating attribution because character traits are perceived as unmodifiable. On the other hand, behavioral self-blame involves blaming one's own actions for the victimization and is adaptive because behavior can be modified. Victims are not responsible for what happened but they are capable of ameliorating their situation.

Research Into Practice: Implications for Intervention

Research focusing on the relationship of victims and victimizers indicates that intervention efforts need to be broadly based (Lane, 1989). There are cultural, familial, and educational forces sanctioning aggression.

In addressing issues of bullies and victims, practitioners need to be mindful of the continuum of victimization from home to school. School violence reflects familial, educational, and societal failures. Family-based interventions to break abusive cycles in the home are ALWAYS indicated for dealing with children as victimizers as well as the victims. Both patterns of interaction learned in the home are carried into the school setting.

In addition to the bully and victim, emphasis needs to be placed on changing the school climate. Children need to have permission to ask adults for help when they are being bullied at

home or school. While the topic of bullying is starting to receive attention from school psychologists in the United States (for example, see Batsche & Knoff, 1994; Batsche & Moore, 1992; Hoover & Hazler, 1991; Larson, 1993; Miller & Rubin, 1992), other countries have been actively addressing the problem. Anti-bullying programs and work on conflict resolution has been conducted in Japan, Sweden, Norway, Ireland, England, and Canada. Ziegler and Rosenstein-Manner (1991) have provided a comprehensive review of programs being carried out internationally to address the problem of bullying in schools.

Prevention

Schools can take the initiative in preventing bully/victim problems. The first step is raising awareness of the scope of the bullying problem. Primary prevention initiatives need to change school climate by encouraging prosocial behavior and respect for all students, and by sending the clear message that oppression will not be tolerated. Based on this review of the research literature, we designed an intervention program: FAIR PLAY (Wilczenski et al., 1994). The program reminds children of their own values and motivates them by their own self-concepts as fair-minded in their interactions with peers. The conceptual framework for this preventive program is systemic with the focus on the interpersonal aspects of the bullying relationship. FAIR PLAY activities are contained in the Appendix.

From the literature review, the rationale for the FAIR PLAY program was derived by examining the motives for bullying as well

as the link between victims and victimizers. Because of the needs for interpersonal power and for affiliation underlying bully behavior, we chose to focus on the group process surrounding bullying. Research suggests that bullies are not necessarily unpopular and may have a loyal following. When bullying occurs in groups, termed "mobbing" by Pikas (1989), there may be a diffusion of the sense of responsibility by participants or bystanders to assist the victim. Group dynamics need to be altered to reduce the status involved in colluding with bullies. Working with victims and victimizers is similar in that behavioral, rather than characterological, attributions are encouraged. One's own actions are manipulable and offer a starting point to foster behavior change in victims and victimizers.

Moreover, there is evidence (Hoffman, 1963, 1975; Thompson & Hoffman, 1980) that the development of prosocial behavior in children is related to the use of victim-centered discipline techniques by parents, i.e., reparation and apology to encourage empathy with victims. Modeling altruism in schools is critical to change the current climate of schools. Hoffman (1975) discussed victim-centered discipline techniques as important in fostering prosocial behavior in children. Victims and victimizers have learned debilitating antisocial patterns of interaction that need to be changed. Victim-centered socialization strategies were employed in FAIR PLAY because that perspective is probably understood by both bullies and victims.

Although some care must be taken to avoid conferring high status to "victimhood," encouraging empathy through victim-centered socialization strategies also gives victims permission to ask for help.

Literature concerning leadership abilities (Trawick-Smith, 1988), ranging from following another's direction to leading a group has been critical in the development of FAIR PLAY. Bullies and victims are deficient in leading and following skills. Leadership skills of compromise and negotiation are an essential part of the program: Children are encouraged to accept others' ideas and to use following behaviors to negotiate the acceptance of their own play suggestions.

In FAIR PLAY, sociodramatic techniques are used as educational modality which distinguishes it from the related technique of psychodrama which is a therapeutic modality (see Moreno, 1953; Sternberg & Garcia, 1989). As an educational modality, sociodrama directs its attention to human growth and interaction. Sociodrama helps to clarify values, problem solve, make decisions, gain greater understanding, learn to play roles in more satisfying ways, and practice new roles. The goals of sociodrama are a deep expression of emotion, a new insight occurring through action, and an opportunity to practice new social roles in a safe environment.

All FAIR PLAY sociodramatic sessions consist of a warm-up, an enactment, and a sharing period (see Appendix). Various warm-up exercises are conducted such as physical activities, which

engage participants' bodies, voices, emotions, and imaginations, and which prepare participants to work together. Next, an *enactment is performed by members* of the group which addresses an agreed-upon social situation or shared concern specifically about bully/victim issues. The purpose of the enactment is to help the participants to work cooperatively and to examine their own thoughts and feelings regarding a wide variety of bully/victim predicaments. Participants experiment in solving problems, and they strive to clarify their own values and to understand others. They explore their "role repertoires" examining both the satisfying and unsatisfying behaviors exhibited in the roles of bully and victim, and how behaviors can be changed. In helping students, group leaders emphasize altering group dynamics associated with bullying and focus on the plight of victims. Following the enactment is the sharing period during which time the group reaches closure by expressing feelings, asking questions, generating alternate solutions, and planning what behaviors to bring into daily life to foster appropriate peer interactions.

FAIR PLAY activities have been compiled and implemented successfully with students in grades 3 through 6 (Wilczenski et al., 1993b). For students participating in the program, results of pre- and post-surveys indicated an increased awareness of various aspects of bullying and the importance of obtaining adult assistance to deal with bullying problems.

Schools are being challenged to serve increasingly diverse student populations. Our hope is that "Fair Play" will promote a norm of fairness in interpersonal relationships and a tolerance for differences.

References

Aber J.L., & Cicchetti, D. (1984). The socioemotional development of maltreated children: An empirical and theoretical analysis. In H. Fitzgerald, B. Lester, & M. Yogman (Eds.). Theory and research in behavioral pediatrics (Vol. 2, pp. 147-205). NY: Plenum.

Allan, J. (1983). Scapegoating: Help for the whole class. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 18, 147-151.

American Psychiatric Association. (1994). Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, C.S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. Review of Educational Research, 52, 368-420.

Atwood, M. (1988). Cat's eye. NY: Doubleday.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1976). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Batsche, G.M., & Knoff, H.M. (1994). Bullies and their victims: Understanding a pervasive problem in the schools. School Psychology Review, 23, 165-174.

Batsche, G., & Moore, B. (1992). Bullying. Helping children grow up in the 90's: A resource book for parents. Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Bender, B. (1976). Self-chosen victims: Scapegoating behavior sequential to battering. Child Welfare, 55, 417-422.

Bennett, J.C. (1990). Nonintervention into siblings' fighting as a catalyst for learned helplessness. Psychological Reports, 66, 139-145.

Besag, V.E. (1989). Bullies and victims in schools. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Bjorkqvist, K., Ekman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. (1982). Bullies and victims: Their ego picture, ideal ego picture and normative ego picture. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23, 307-313.

Boulton, M.J., & Underwood, K. (1992). Bully/victim problems among middle school children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 62, 73-87.

Bowers, L., Smith, P.K., & Binney, V. (1992). Cohesion and power in the families of children in bully/victim problems at school. Journal of Family Therapy, 14, 371-387.

Bullies and their victims. (1987, November). The Harvard Education Letter, 3, 1-3.

Brody, G.H., & Stoneman, Z. (1987). Sibling conflict: Contributions of the siblings themselves, the parent-sibling relationship, and the broader family system. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 19, 39-53.

Burgess, A.W. & Holmstrom, L. (1979). Rape: Crisis and recovery. Bowie, MD:

Coie, J.D., Dodge, K.A., Terry, R., & Wright, V. (1991). The role of aggression in peer relations: an analysis of aggression episodes in boys' play groups. Child Development, 62, 812-826.

Commission for Racial Equality. (1988). Learning in terror! A survey of racial harassment in schools and colleges. London: Author.

DePaulo, B.M. & Fisher, J.D. (1980). The costs of asking for help. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 1, 23-35.

Derby, O.L. (1947). Should I teach pupils to fight? Clearing House, 21, 146-147.

Dinkmeyer, D., & McKay, G. (1973). Raising a responsible child: Practical steps to successful family relationships. NY: Simon & Schuster.

Dishion, T.J., Patterson, G.R., Stoolmiller, M., & Skinner, M.L. (1991). Family, school, and behavioral antecedents to early adolescent involvement with antisocial peers. Developmental Psychology, 27, 172-180.

Dodge, K.A., Bates, J.E., Pettit, J.P. (1990). Mechanisms in the cycle of violence. Science, 250, 1678-1683.

Dreikurs, R. (1964). Children, the challenge. NY: Hawthorne.

Duyme, M. (1990). Antisocial behaviour and postnatal environment: A French adoption study. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 31, 699-710.

Eckenrode, J., Laird, M., & Doris, J. (1993). School performance and disciplinary problems among abused and neglected children. Developmental Psychology, 29, 53-62.

Eron, L.D., & Huesmann, L.R. (1984). The relation of prosocial behavior to the development of aggression and psychopathology. Aggressive Behavior, 10, 201-211.

Floyd, N.M. (1985). "Pick on someone your own size!": Controlling victimization. Pointer, 29, 9-17.

Floyd, N.M. (1986, May 12). Studying the behavior of bully and victim. The New York Times, pp. 1-2.

Floyd, N.M. (1987, Winter). Terrorism in the schools. School Safety, pp. 22-25.

Foster, S.L., DeLawyer, D.D., & Guevremont, D.C. (1986). A critical incident analysis of liked and disliked peer behaviors and their situation parameters in childhood and adolescence. Behavioral Assessment, 8, 115-133.

Franklin, A. & Benedict, A.E. (1951). Must children fight? Parents Magazine, 26, 71-73.

Garofalo, J., Siegel, L., & Laub, J. (1987). School-related victimization: An analysis of National Crime Survey (NCS) Narratives. Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 3, 321-338.

Gilmartin, B.G. (1987). Peer group antecedents of severe love-shyness in males. Journal of Personality, 55, 467-489.

Gove, W.R. (1975). The labelling of deviance: Evaluating a perspective. NY: Sage.

Greenbaum, S. (1988). Set straight on bullies. Malibu, CA: National School Safety Center.

Hall, G.S. (1904). Adolescence. NY: Appleton.

Hazler, J.R., Hoover, J.H., & Oliver, R. (1991). Student perceptions of victimization by bullies in school. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 29, 143-150.

Hiroto, D.S., & Seligman, M.E. (1975). Generality of learned helplessness in man. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 311-327.

Hoffman, M.L. (1963). Parent discipline and the child's consideration for others. Child Development, 34, 573-588.

Hoffman, M.L. (1975). Altruistic behavior and the parent-child relationship. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31, 937-943.

Hoover, J., & Hazler, R.J. (1991). Bullies and victims. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25, 212-219.

Hotelling, C. (1970). When toddlers act up. Parents Magazine, 45, 85-86.

Hranitz, J.R., & Eddowes, E.A. (1990). Violence: A crisis in homes and schools. Childhood Education, 66, 4-7.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma. NY: Free Press.

Janoff-Bulman, R., & Frieze, I.H. (1983). A theoretical perspective for understanding reactions to victimization. Journal of Social Issues, 39, 1-17.

Jersild, A.T., & Markey, F.V. (1935). Conflicts between preschool children. Child Development Monographs, 21.

Kaplan, H.B. (1980). Deviant behavior in defense of the self. NY: Academic Press.

Kaufman, J.M. (1985). Characteristics of children's behavior disorders (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill.

Kikkawa, M. (1987). Teachers' opinions and treatments for bully/victim problems among students in junior and senior high schools: Results of a fact-finding survey. Journal of Human Development, 23, 25-30.

Lane, D.A. (1988). Violent histories: Bullying and criminality. In D.P. Tattum & D.A. Lane (Eds.). Bullying in schools (pp. 95-104). Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Lane, D.A. (1989). Bullying in school: The need for an integrated approach. School Psychology International, 10, 211-215.

Larson, J. (1993). School psychologists' perceptions of physically aggressive student behavior as a referral concern in nonurban districts. Psychology in the Schools, 30, 345-350.

Lerner, M.J. (1980). The belief in a just world. NY: Plenum.

Levi, A.M., Buskila, M., & Gerzi, S. (1977). Benign neglect: Reducing fights among siblings. Journal of Individual Psychology, 33, 240-245.

Lowenstein, L.F. (1978). Who is the bully? Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 31, 147-149.

Manning, M., Heron, J., & Marshall, T. (1978). Styles of hostility and social interactions at nursery, at school and at home: An extended study of children. In L.A. Hersov, M. Berger, & D. Shaffer (Eds.). Aggression and antisocial behavior in childhood and adolescence (pp. 29-58). NY: Pergamon.

Marion, M. (1982). Mary just hit Tommy - again! Day Care and Early Education, 9, 13-15.

Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary (10th ed.). (1993). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Miller, G.E., & Rubin, K.A. (1992, September). Victimization of school-age children. NASP Communique, 21.

Moreno, J.L. (1953). Who shall survive? Foundations of sociometry, group psychotherapy, and sociodrama. NY: Beacon House.

Morton, T. (1987). Childhood aggression in the context of family interaction. In D.H. Crowell, I.M. Evans, & C.R. O'Donnell (Eds.). Childhood aggression and violence: Sources of influence, prevention, and control (pp. 117-158). NY: Plenum.

National Institute of Education. (1978). Violent schools - safe schools: The safe school study report to congress (Vol. 1). Washington, DC: Author (ERIC Document Reproduction Service, No. ED 149 464).

National School Safety Center. (1989, June). School bullying and victimization resource paper. Malibu, CA: Pepperdine University.

Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1989, October). Weapons in school. Washington, DC: Department of Justice.

Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys. NY: Wiley.

Olweus, D. (1980). Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis. Developmental Psychology, 16, 644-660.

Olweus, D. (1984). Aggressors and their victims: Bullying at school. In N. Frude & H. Gault (Eds.). Disruptive behavior in the schools (pp. 57-76). NY: Wiley.

Olweus, D. (1987, Fall). Schoolyard bullying - grounds for intervention. School Safety, 4-11.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.). The development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1993). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term outcomes. In K.H. Rubin & J.B. Asendorf (Eds.). Social withdrawal, inhibition, and shyness in childhood (pp. 315-326). London: Erlbaum.

O'Moore, M. (1988). Bullying in schools. (Council of Europe Report, DECS-EGT [88] 5-E). Strasbourg: Council for Cultural Cooperation.

Parks, A.L. (1986). Managing violent and disruptive behaviors. In T.N. Fairchild (Ed.). Crisis intervention strategies for school-based helpers, (pp. 286-320) Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Patterson, G.R. (1982). Coercive family process. Eugene, OR: Castalia.

Perry, D.G., Williard, J.C., & Perry, L.C. (1990). Peers perceptions of the consequences that victimized children provide aggressors. Child Development, 61, 1310-1325.

Pikas, A. (1989). A pure concept of mobbing gives the best results for treatment. School Psychology International, 10, 95-104.

Pine, G.J., & Hilliard, A.G. (1990). Rx for racism: Imperatives for America's schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 71, 593-600.

Roberts, M. (1988). Schoolyard menace. Psychology Today, 22, 52, 54-56.

Roland, E. (1989). Bullying: The Scandinavian research tradition. In D.P. Tattum & D.A. Lane (Eds.), Bullying in schools (pp. 21-32). Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Rosen, M. (1985). Kingfisher book of children's poetry. Las Vegas, NV: Kingfisher Books.

Rutter, M. (1985). Family and school influences on behavioral development. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 26, 349-368.

Salzinger, S., Feldman, R.S., Hammer, M., & Rosario, M. (1993). The effects of physical abuse on children's social relationships. Child Development, 64, 169-187.

Schacter, F.F., & Stone, R.K. (1987). Comparing and contrasting siblings: Defining the self. Journal of Children in Contemporary Society, 19, 55-75.

Seligman, M.E. (1975). Helplessness: On depression, development, and death. San Francisco, CA: Freeman.

Shannon, D.C. (1956). What about fighting? Grade Teacher, 74, 66.

Stephens, R.D. (1988, Jan./Feb.). The risk and the response. School Leader, 22-25.

Stephenson, P., & Smith, D. (1989). Bullying in the junior school. In D.P. Tattum & D.A. Lane (Eds.). Bullying in schools (pp. 45-57). Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Sternberg, K.J., Lamb, M.E., Greenbaum, C., Cicchetti, D., Dawud, S., Cortes, R.M., Krispin, O., & Lorey, F. (1993). Effects of domestic violence on children's behavior problems and depression. Developmental Psychology, 29, 44-52.

Sternberg, P., & Garcia, A. (1989). Sociodrama: Who's in your shoes? NY: Praeger.

Stocker, C., Dunn, J., & Plomin, R. (1989). Sibling relationships: Links with child temperament, maternal behavior, and family structure. Child Development, 60, 715-727.

Straus, M.A. (1991). Discipline and deviance: Physical punishment of children and violence and other crime in adulthood. Social Problems, 38, 133-154.

Tattum, D.P. (1989). Violence and aggression in schools. In D.P. Tattum & D.A. Lane (Eds.). Bullying in schools (pp.7-19). Stoke-on-Trent, England: Trentham Books.

Taylor, S.E., Wood, J.V., & Lichtman, R.R. (1983). It could be worse: Selective evaluation as a response to victimization, Journal of Social Issues, 39, 19-40.

Thompson, R.A., & Hoffman, M.L. (1980). Empathy and the development of guilt in children. Developmental Psychology, 16, 155-156.

Thompson, S.C. (1981). Will it hurt less if I can control it? A complex answer to a simple question. Psychological Bulletin, 90, 89-101.

Toch, T., Gest, T., & Guttman, M. (1993, November). When killers come to class: Violence in schools. U.S. News & World Report, 31-37.

Trawick-Smith, J. (1988). "Let's say you're the baby, OK?": Play leadership and following behavior of young children. Young Children, 43, 51-59.

Vissing, Y.M., Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Harrop, J.W. (1991). Verbal aggression by parents and psychological problems of children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 15, 223-238.

Walker, L.E. (1979). The battered woman. NY: Harper & Row.

Whitney, I., & Smith, P.K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. Educational Research, 35, 3-25.

Widom, C.S. (1989a). Does violence breed violence? A critical examination of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 106, 3-28.

Widom, C.S. (1989b). The cycle of violence. Science, 244, 160-166.

Wilczenski, F.L., Steegmann, R., Braun, M., Feeley, F., Griffin, J., Horowitz, T., & Olson, S. (1993a). Bully problem surveys. Unpublished manuscript.

Wilczenski, F.L., Steegmann, R., Braun, M., Feeley, F., Griffin, J., Horowitz, T., & Olson, S. (1993b). FAIR PLAY Manual. Unpublished manuscript.

Wilczenski, F.L., Steegmann, R., Braun, M., Feeley, F., Griffin, J., Horowitz, T., & Olson, S. (1994, March). Children as victims and victimizers: Home- and school-based interventions. Workshop presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Seattle, WA.

Woolfson, R. (1989). Bullying at school: The bully and victim. Health at School, 4, 174-175.

Ziegler, S., & Rosenstein-Manner, M. (1991). Bullying at school: Toronto in an international context. Research Services Report No. 196. Toronto: Board of Education.

Appendix

FAIR PLAY Activities

WARM-UPS

ADJECTIVE NAME GAME (5 minutes)

Say, "This game is called the "Adjective Name Game." While we're standing in the circle, each of us is going to introduce himself or herself to the group with three things - a first name, an adjective (or describing word) that's positive (or nice) and begins with the same first letter as our names, and a gesture (or movement) that everybody else will be able to imitate. FOR EXAMPLE, I'm Fantastic Fran [*insert your name and describing word here and demonstrate a simple physical gesture*]."

When the children seem to understand their task, further explain, "Pay attention to each person, because as we go around the circle, each new person will do all the other names and gestures before adding his or her own name and gesture. Any questions?"

Clarify by example or by repeating directions in your own words if necessary. If someone gets stuck on a name and gesture, invite the originator (or the group) to help the person recall the name and gesture.

When the circle is completed, invite individuals to try everyone's names and gestures alone. Then invite the group to try all the names and gestures together.

PATTERN BALL (5 minutes)

DO NOT EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE OR RULES OF PATTERN BALL AT THE OUTSET!

Present one foam ball to the group, throw it to a person, and say, "Toss the ball to somebody who hasn't had it yet." Repeat that direction as necessary until the last person has touched the ball. Then say, "Now toss it back to me."

Next begin the pattern again by tossing it to the first person in the pattern and saying, "Now toss it to the same person as you did last time." Repeat 2 or 3 times without stopping.

Then, WITHOUT STOPPING, say "Now let's see if we can handle more than one ball at a time."

Gradually introduce one more ball at a time for a total of four to five balls at most. Praise team efforts continously and, if necessary, remind the players not to whip the ball or otherwise make it difficult to catch.

If time permits, ask the children their feelings about the game and lead the discussion toward the cooperative, non-competetive aspects of the game.

MIRROR GAMES

GROUP MIRROR (5 minutes)

Say, "This next game is called the Mirror Game. I'd like you to split into two rows facing each other. OK. Give yourself enough room between yourselves and between the rows. Now I'm going to move and I want everyone to move exactly as I do. People opposite me can see me easily enough to 'mirror' everything I do. People on my side can look at people on the opposite side and 'mirror' them. If we all concentrate and pay attention we will all be moving the same way at the same time."

Begin movement. Reinforce the efforts of individuals and those of the group.

Then say, AS YOU CONTINUE THE GROUP MOVEMENT, "Now I'm going to ask other people to be the leaders. When I say your name, you will be in charge of leading our movement. Try to take over the movement very smoothly so that somebody watching wouldn't know that we changed leaders. And remember to only do movements that everyone else is able to do with you."

Continue to praise efforts and allow each child the opportunity to lead (unless they clearly express that they would rather not).

FREE ASSOCIATION FOAM BALL/ BUILD-A-STORY (ADD-A-SENTENCE) (5 minutes)

Invite the children to sit in place in the circle. With one foam ball in hand, say "In this next game, we're going to toss one ball around the circle. I'll start it by saying one word. When you get the ball, say whatever word comes to your head and then toss the ball to the next person."

Use the following words as "prompt" words for this game:

BULLIES TEASING HITTING AFRAID

IF the resulting one-word responses stray completely from the theme of the day after numerous attempts, move on to the next game immediately.

Say, "This next game is called the "Build-A-Story" game. We're going to build a story by going around the circle one at a time and letting each person add one sentence to the story. We can use a ball again if you want. I'll start."

Use the following "starter" sentences for this game:

ONCE THERE WAS A BULLY IN SCHOOL...
ONCE THERE WAS A NEW KID IN SCHOOL...
ONCE THERE WAS A KID WHO OTHER KIDS BULLIED...
ONCE THERE WAS A KID WHO WAS AFRAID TO GO TO THE LOCKER ROOM...
ONCE THERE WAS A KID WHO NEVER GOT INVITED TO PARTIES...

YES (5 minutes)

Say, "This game is called 'YES.' I'd like all of you to get back up on your feet for this game. OK. In this game a person shouts out an idea for all of us to do with our bodies - like a gesture or a movement - and does it, too. Everybody else in the group then shouts out 'YES!' and them starts doing the same thing until somebody shouts out a new idea. FOR EXAMPLE, [*give an example of your own, such as running in place or jumping on one foot, etc.*]. Remember to only suggest things that we can all do."

BACKGROUND FOR ENACTMENTS

THEMES:	SETTINGS:	PERSONS:
TEASING	BUS	STUDENTS
WEIGHT	GYM	PARENTS
HEIGHT	LIBRARY	TEACHERS
CLOTHING/HAIR	HALLWAY	NEIGHBORS
DISABILITY	FIELD TRIPS	OLDER KIDS
MATERIAL GOODS	BATHROOM	YOUNGER KIDS
REJECTION	CAFETERIA	COLLUDERS
EXCLUSION	BUS STOP	BULLIES
COLLUISON	PLAYGROUND	BYSTANDERS
EMOTIONAL ASSAULT	LOCKER ROOM	SIBLINGS
PHYSICAL ASSAULT	PARTIES	COUSINS
EXPLOITATION	STAIRWELL	BEST FRIENDS
	COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES	RIVALS
	WALKING HOME	CLIQUES
	SPORTS EVENTS	CHEERLEADERS
	THE MALL	JOCKS
		BRAINS

ASSIGN OR AGREE UPON SPECIFIC THEMES, LOCATIONS, AND PERSONS BEFORE STUDENTS BEGIN PREPARATION.

REMIND PARTICIPANTS THAT ALL "ENACTMENTS" HAVE A BEGINNING, A MIDDLE, AND AN END.

REMEMBER TO ENCOURAGE ONE ADAPTIVE ENDING (SOLUTION) AND ONE NON-ADAPTIVE ENDING (UNRESOLVED CONFLICT).

SAMPLE ENACTMENTS

The Players: Michelle, Jennifer, Tom, Suzanne, Fran

Gym Class #1 (non-adaptive)

Introduction: "This enactment takes place during gym class. Team leader Michelle is choosing her team. We can't see the other leader. Jen, Tom, Fran, and Suzanne are waiting to be picked."

Michelle: I choose Jen.

Jen: Whoo Whoo !! Yes!

[Michelle and Jen do a high five, etc.]

Jen: [in Michelle's ear] Pick Tom. Pick Tom. He's good.

Michelle: OK OK. We'll take Tom.

[All slap hands, cheer, etc. Then huddle to discuss remaining two players.]

Jen: Don't pick Fran. He stinks. We don't want him.

Tom: Yeah, but Suzanne's a total spaz. I don't want either of them to be on my team.

Michelle: No doubt about it. Fran is the worst. I've made up my mind. [Aloud for all to hear] I pick Suzanne.

[Suzanne sneers at Fran and joins team with high fives and cheers all around.]

Michelle: [To gym teacher]. What's that coach? We get Fran? Oh, man!

[Random comments are heard such as "No way, man!," "Let the other team have him!," and "I hate getting stuck on a team with him!" When Fran comes to the group, no high fives or cheers are exchanged. In fact, nobody greets him or even acknowledges him with words or eye contact.]

Tom: [Bright and cruel] Yeah, at least now we have somebody to blame when we lose!

[Team runs ahead of Fran toward playing field.]

Jen: [Turning around toward Fran and pointing away from group]. The outfield's <u>that</u> way!

Gym Class #2 (adaptive)

Introduction: "This enactment also takes place during gym class."

Michelle: I choose Jen.

Jen: Whoo Whoo !! Yes!

[Michelle and Jen do a high five, etc.]

Jen: [in Michelle's ear] Pick Tom. Pick Tom. He's good.

Michelle: OK OK. We'll take Tom.

[All slap hands, cheer, etc. Then huddle to discuss remaining two players.]

Jen: Don't pick Fran. He stinks. We don't want him.

Tom: He's really not very good. Why don't you pick Suzanne?

Michelle: Fran's a nice guy, but he just can't hit or catch. I've made up my mind. [Aloud for all to hear] I pick Suzanne.

[Suzanne joins team with high fives and cheers all around.]

Michelle: [To gym teacher]. What's that coach? We get Fran? All right, that's cool! Come on Fran!

Jen: What are we going to do with him on the team?

Michelle: He's not that good. Maybe we can teach him a thing or two.

Tom: Yeah, we can help him!

[Random comments are heard such as "Let's go Fran," "High five Fran," and "Let's give him a shot at third base." Fran joins team and is met with enthusiastic acknowledgement from all team members.]

Tom: Fran, come here. Let me give you a few tips on hitting.

Fran: Thanks!

Michelle: Go team!!! Whoo!!

[All run off together making appropriate animal noises.]

Playground #1 (non-adaptive)

Introduction: "This enactment takes place on the playground. There are no adults around, so it is up to the kids to decide how things will turn out."

[Jen and Michelle and Tom are tossing a ball and enjoying themselves. Fran and Suzanne are seated near them. Tom misses a toss and leaves his immediate group to retrieve the ball. Fran approaches him and takes the ball away from him. He begins a game of "keep away" with Suzanne, who laughs hysterically, thereby encouraging Fran. Jen and Michelle also join in keeping the ball away from Tom.]

Tom: [To Fran] What did you do that for?

Fran: [Challengingly] What are you going to do about it?

[Suzanne laughs. Tom starts to exit.]

Fran: Yeah, you better run home. Wuss!

[All others exit on opposite side, laughing and continuing to verbally mock Tom.]

Playground #2 (adaptive)

Introduction: "This enactment also takes place on the playground."

[Jen and Michelle and Tom are tossing a ball and enjoying themselves. Fran and Suzanne are seated near them. Tom misses a toss and leaves his immediate group to retrieve the ball. Fran approaches him and takes the ball away. He attempts to begin a game of "keep away" with Suzanne, but she does not cooperate.]

Suzanne: What did you do that for?

Fran: Come on, Suzanne. Catch it and keep away from Tom.

Suzanne: No! Why should I?

Fran: Because he's a wuss!
[Disappointed that nobody will play along with him] Man! You guys are no fun at all!

[Fran tosses the ball to Tom, disgusted at the others].

Jen: Tom, let's play over here.

[Jen and Michelle and Tom move slightly further away from Fran. Suzanne walks away from Fran and joins the group playing ball.]

Suzanne: [To Fran]. I don't think I want to hang out with you anymore. [To the group]. Can I join you guys? Thanks.

[Jen, Michelle, Suzanne, and Tom begin to toss the ball again. A few moments later Fran joins the circle. Jen gets the ball and holds it. She looks at Fran.]

Jen: Well?

Fran: Okay, I'm sorry. I want to play with you.

Jen: That's more like it.

[Nods and words of agreement follow from the group. All the players play ball together.]

A. This enactment takes place on the bus to school. There are three children involved. At the beginning of the scene, two children are on the bus and a third is boarding. The child boarding the bus goes to sit with one child, but the child doesn't want him to sit with him. He is unkind about telling him to go sit somewhere else.
IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

The first outcome could be that the uninvolved child joins in with the unkind child to abuse or "pick on" the boarding child as well.

In the second enactment, the uninvolved child could invite the boarding child to sit with him and say to the "bully" that what he did was not very nice.

B. This enactment takes place in the lunch line of the cafeteria. Three children are involved. One could be older than the other two (i.e., a "big kid"). The "big kid" takes a dessert from one of the two younger kids.
IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

The first outcome could be that the bully takes the dessert successfully. The uninvolved child could laugh at the situation and tease the other young child for losing his dessert.

In the second enactment, the uninvolved child could intervene, either by asking an adult for help, or speaking out to the bully that what he did wasn't right and that it would be reported.

C This enactment takes place in the boys' bathroom. Three children are involved. At the beginning one is in the bathroom. When the second enters, the first demands his lunch money. The second begins to give it to him when the third child enters. The bully tells them that they both better keep their mouth shut.
IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

The first outcome could be that the third child (who has just come in) promises the bully that he will not tell an adult and laughs at the victim.

In the second enactment, the third child could support the victim, telling him not to give the bully any money, and suggesting "let's get out of here." (The idea here is that the uninvolved child assists in getting the victim out of the abusive setting).

D This enactment takes place on a field trip to the zoo. It involves three children. The children can pretend that there are others (i.e., more than three) on the trip. A bully says to another child something along the lines of "Go away! We don't want you to hang around with us... on this trip... "
IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

In the first enactment, the child who is uninvolved can join in with the bully, telling the other child to go away- that he is not wanted.

In the second enactment, the third child can intervene, explaining aloud that the child (victim) is a nice person and deserves to be treated better. The intervening child can invite the rejected child to spend time with him ("Come with me") and "leave the fold" of the bully.

E. This enactment takes place at the bus stop. It involves three children. The bully in this one is pushing and shoving others close to the street. One child tells the bully to stop it. The bully responds with a challenging "What are you going to do about it?"

IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

In the first, nobody helps and the bully continues to push and shove.

In the second one, the uninvolved child joins the other non-bully and explains to the bully that what he is doing is unsafe. The two non-bullies agree together that maybe they should let an adult know about the unsafe situation at the bus stop.

F. This enactment takes place in gym class. Three children are involved. The bully is making fun of a child who is overweight and not good at sports.

IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

In the first enactment, the uninvolved child joins the bully in making fun of the overweight child and encourages the bully to exclude the child from playing with them.

In the second enactment, the uninvolved child invites the overweight child to play with him and offers to help teach him to play sports better. He could also invite the bully to play with them and help the unathletic child to learn.

G. This enactment takes place on the phone. Two children are pretending to call one another. One child says to the other, "I don't want to be your friend anymore, because the kids at school say you are a nerd/geek/different."

IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

In the first enactment, the alleged "nerd" becomes angry and defensive by shouting and hanging up the phone.

In the second enactment, the alleged "nerd" asks the friend, "Do you think I am a nerd/geek/different" They can then discuss whether or not people with differences should be excluded/ignored/left out of things. Is it fair? When some people treat others unfairly, does that mean that I/we have to do the same?

H. This enactment takes place in the stairwell or hallway between classes. There are three people involved (an adult can participate if necessary). One student walks past another and deliberately knocks the books out of the his hands.

IDEAS FOR OUTCOMES:

In the first enactment, the bully laughs and the third person joins in the laughter. They slaps hands (high-five style) and walk off together, leaving the person alone to pick up his books.

In the second enactment, the uninvolved person rushes to assist the person who has lost his books. This person also says to the bully that what he did was not very nice. When the bully leaves, the two remaining students discuss whether or not they should report the bully's behavior or ask a teacher or other adult for help.